Middle-Mile Advisory Committee
March 18, 2022
Meeting Recap and Transcript

The Middle-Mile Advisory Committee met on Friday, March 18, 2022 at 10:00am PST via virtual conference.

Agenda Item 1: Welcome and Overview

Chair Nichols welcomed everyone to the meeting.

A quorum for the meeting was established.

Member		Designee	Present	Absent
California Department of Technology	Russ Nichols		X	
California Public Utilities Commission	Alice Reynolds		X	
Department of Finance	Gayle Miller		X	
Government Operations Agency	Amy Tong		X	
Department of Transportation	Steven Keck	Michael Keever	X	
State Senate	Lena Gonzalez	(Ex-Officio Member)		X
State Senate	Mike McGuire	(Ex-Officio Member)	X	
State Assembly	Sharon Quirk-Silva	(Ex-Officio Member)	X	
State Assembly	Jim Wood	(Ex-Officio Member)	X	

Agenda Item 2: Executive Report Out

Mark Monroe provided updates focused around:
- The initial 18 projects.
- Conditional California Advanced Services Fund (CASF) approval.
- Procurement.
- Annual Report.
- California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) SB 156 mapping analysis.

Agenda Item 3: Project Updates

Paul Chung provided a California Department of Transportation update focused on:
- Preconstruction work.
- Engagement with resource agencies.

Rob Osborne provided a California Public Utilities Commission update focused on:
- Analysis and prioritization.
- Public comment.
- Last-Mile.

Tony Naughtin of the Third Party Administrator provided updates on the 18 initial projects:
- Siskiyou
- Plumas, Tehama
- Lake
- Colusa
- Alpine
- Amador
- Calaveras
- Oakland
- Central Coast
- West Fresno
- Inyo
- Kern
- Kern / San Luis Obispo
- San Bernardino
- Los Angeles
- Orange County
- Coachella Valley
- Riverside / San Diego

Mark Monroe provided a California Department of Technology update focused on:
- Expanded construction approval.
- Next steps.

Agenda Item 4: Public Comment

Staff noted written public comments were submitted by (attached):
- Andrew Kastner.

Public comments were made by:
- Stan – CWA
- Shayne Englin
- Jaden Shandler
- Scott Pholman
- Ciara Keegan

Closing Remarks

Mr. Monroe talked about the approach moving forward.

Mr. Nichols thanked Committee members, staff, and attendees and noted the next meeting is

Friday, April 22.

The meetings adjourned at 11:30am PST.

(meeting transcript attached; video and presentation slides from meeting posted to Committee web site)

Transcript

Thank you. Good morning, everybody. Welcome to the March Middle Mile Advisory Committee. I'm Russ Nichols. I'll be chairing the meeting today and I am the Acting Director at the Department of Technology. I will speak quickly about the new format that we're using this month. But so that we can mute mics a little bit sooner. Let's do roll calls first, and then I'll walk through the rules of engagement. So Jules, could you run through roll call real quickly.

I am going to run through roll call, and I think there was little error if you're a member of the public, your camera should not be on so we will definitely request that you do turn them off. Director Nichols?

 Here.

President Reynolds?

Here.

Deputy Director Miller?

Here.

Deputy Director Keever?

Secretary Tong?

Here.

Senator Gonzales?

Senator McGuire?

Here.

Assembly Member Quirk-Silva?

Here.

Assembly member Wood?

Here.

We do have a quorum before we move forward with the meeting a few reminders. There is time at the end of the meeting for public comment for those who will be providing public comments via phone, and this is solely for those providing public comments via phone. Please text or email, middlemile@state.ca.gov, Again, middlemile.state.ca.gov with the number you are calling from noting that you will be making public comment via phone. We will repeat this information at the start of the public comment period. We respectfully request of those making public comment please refrain from raising their hands until the designated public comment period at the end of the meeting. For presenters, please queue Laura to advance your slide. For everyone, please raise your hand if you wish to speak so Katherine can unmute you, it will take a few seconds. Keep an eye out there will be a box

that pops up that says the host would like you to unmute. Once that box pops up please go ahead and quickly unmute button and then once you unmute, you'll be able to speak. Thank you.

Thank you very much, Jules. Good morning everyone. As we jump in this month, you've noticed that we do have a slightly different configuration in our zoom setting. Jules just went through a bunch of information there. The simple reminder is any time a committee member would like to speak please in the reactions button in the Zoom client on the raise the hand icon or button, raise your hand we'll acknowledge you and we will turn on your mic and then you will have a second step of unmuting yourself so you'll get a pop up but Jules mentioned so thank you and for anyone that is coming, coming on late. The folks that are on camera should be the committee members. And again, we will call on the public at the end of the meeting. So, thank you for the patience as we move to this more secure platform. We did have an unfortunate incident with some folks joining the meeting and distributing inappropriate content in the last meeting. So again, I thank you for your patience with the new format. We expect this to be maybe a little more overhead labor intensive, but it will help us facilitate this public meeting better. So, with that, thank you again Jules. We do have a quorum and we will jump right in we have a fairly busy agenda today. So let me start out with our executive report out from Monroe. Mark? And Katherine if you can go ahead and unmute.

Alright. Can everybody hear me all right? Yes. All right. Good morning. Mark Monroe, Deputy Director for Middle-Mile Broadband Initiative. Happy to be able to report to all the committee members on kind of the status here of this broadband initiative project this morning. Well, in terms of the initial 18 projects, we announced them last November and Caltrans has continued to work on those. Those totaled about 885 miles. But in addition to that, this past February last month, GoldenState Net had developed recommendations on alternative routes for the team initial projects, originally announced in November and they're really intended to consider the broader network design needs and GoldenState Net will be presenting these recommendations a little later this morning. And then in a in response to this a few weeks ago CDT had asked Caltrans to move forward with the expanded construction components of these recommendations. And, and we will be walking the committee through those in a few minutes here as well. In terms of the conditional cast app approvals, we CDT and PUC have met with the grant recipients to identify any overlapping components that could, we could potentially partner on in terms of building out the middle mile. And so those meetings are ongoing, and then we're moving forward to approve any where there's not an overlap so that we don't end up delaying any of those projects. Then, as most people are aware, last Friday, we were able to go out with the procurements for 6000 miles of fiber and associated materials. The purpose of the of this as opposed to solicit bidders to provide the CDT a chance to get ahead of any supply chain delays. The miles are more of fiber. More than 1200 miles, uh 1200 volts, 130 repeater huts, and all the other associated construction materials that go along with that. And again, this is enough to, to build roughly 6000 miles of the estimated 8000 plus mile system. And again, based on funding the procurement allows us to procure more, and if we can afford to build more, which is certainly our intent. We expect multiple bids and for very kind of varying sets of components and materials and, and the majority of these materials would be for the constructions that occur between 2023 and 2026 as we move forward towards the federal deadline. We this week, we're able to post the, the annual report this week, you know still early on in the project as I think we had indicated you know, there's a lot of metrics that will be provided for in the annual report. We're still fairly early and so the report right now really highlights the 885 miles of construction that we've announced so far identifies the, you know the current estimate of $340 million for construction

and, and just kind of as an order of magnitude and scale, we've identified that there are 279,000 individuals, households, and non-households together within five miles of these middle mile locations that can potentially be served once, once the network is completed. And then the last piece here, we know that the Public Utilities Commission has, you know, they've been very busy with their mapping efforts and this this whole past year in December they provided, were able to post an updated build map with public comments, and the Public Utilities Commission has since completed their SB 156 mapping analysis and they will be presenting that a little later this morning as well. So, with that, can turn it back to the committee or we can move on to Caltrans to provide their project update.

Thank you very much Mark. At this point, are there any committee members that have questions for Deputy Director Monroe if there are please just select the raised hand button and we will unmute you so that you can ask your question. Okay. Not seeing any pop up we will go ahead and transition. Lots of information in the updates and we'll start off with Paul Chung from Caltrans. So, Katherine, if you can unmute Paul, we will get started with that. Thank you.

Thank you. Good morning. Good morning committee members, I'm Paul Chung representing California Department of Transportation. Caltrans is currently focusing on pre-construction activities such as environmental studies, subsurface utility, location identification, and also design plans/preparation for these build sites. Before the environmental studies, we're analyzing the effect and impact of the project on the natural environment including biological and cultural surveys. And we're identifying potential project location that have more challenges with environmental clearance permitting, and we're working around existing utilities. We will sequence the work of these locations with our partners to ensure sufficient and efficient time to address these challenges. We're also assessing locations to determine if you can avoid moving existing utilities. And that includes investigation of these local utilities such as high-pressure gas lines, electric lines, using *<indiscernible>* and drone surveys. In addition, we're conducting field reviews with our project teams. And in design we are identifying where to place these locations and vaults to avoid some, some of the sensitive areas in existing utilities. For the delivery methods, we are determining and assessing using traditional design bid build and also taking advantage of the *<indiscernible>* job order contracting design build methods to provide us flexibilities to streamline the project delivery timeline. Next slide please.

And Paul I apologize. Let me interrupt you here momentarily. Member Quirk Silva. Did I see you actually raise your hand on camera and I missed you? Katherine, can you unmute Assembly member Quirk Silva.

Yeah, I did have a few questions, but I can wait. It's fine. I'll just wait till the end.

Okay. We'll pull you back in at the end of the Caltrans presentation. I apologize for that.

No, no problem. Okay.

All right. Thank you.

All right, Paul please proceed. Thank you.

Okay. CDT, TPA, and Caltrans were collaborating to outreach to four levels of the resource agency partners, federal, state, local and tribal governments. The first step the purpose is to provide information on SB 156, the middle mile broadband initiatives to establish early understanding of cultural environmental and permitting processes that may impact the timeline of project delivery. And also, we

want to collaborate with the partners to streamline these processes. We have met with the California Natural Resources Agency, the Coastal Commission, the State Water Resources Control Board, State Historic Preservation Office and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife. And we have met with them to discuss opportunities to streamline the issuance of the resource related permits and preparing them ready for potential increase of the primary requests. Our next steps in collaboration with TPA and CDT is to follow up meeting with the federal, local, and tribal government considerations. With that I'll pass to take any questions from the committee members.

Thank you all, Paul. Once again, for the committee members. Simply raise your hand using the reactions button in Zoom if you have questions. That'll bubble up to the top and we can call on you. And member Quirk Silva if you would like to address your question at this point, we can do that as well. While you're coming off mute. Secretary Tong has a question.

Yes, thank you, Russ um or Director Nichols. I just want to have a quick question for Paul that I glad to hear, glad to see there's a concerted effort to talk to these permitting agencies, I saw there's a number of them on the slide, didn't realize there were that many. Is the, are there welcoming participation in terms of you know, there's early outreach and are there openness to streamline the permitting process to allow Caltrain and CDT and TPA to move more expeditiously on these construction efforts?

Maybe Mark you can, or Mark and Scott you can speak to what was your impression?

 Can folks hear me? Yeah. So, Scott Adams and I have been working with Caltrans and a number of these permitting agencies. I think that, I think we've been generally pleased with the with the reception, I think in some cases in a lot of cases, the challenge we run into is that you might have an agency that they have a headquarters presence that you know, we can we kind of started reaching out to and talking there but there's a lot of, you know, more district or regional level authorities that we have to, their presence is that, that is really the challenge and so we began to reach out with them as well, trying to look at statewide basically statewide permit approaches, right, there's sometimes, you know, when you look at, say a Caltrans project where we have, you know, you're gonna be working on say, 50 miles of freeway say along the coast, for example. You know, that's, you work with the regional presence there in terms of, you know, water quality and the others and you and it's really gonna be project based because we have the broader map and because it's a statewide project, we're trying to meet with these agencies, and it's in a lot in some cases, it's not terribly unprecedented, but to really have that that broader statewide approach. So, I would say in general, they've been good partners. I feel like we're still a little early on in the process in terms of going from presenting the project, presenting the map of the project, presenting how the schedule and how we plan on moving forward with it, it actually matters the fact that you know, it's a good thing for the project in a lot of ways that we're undergrounding it because that anything that's not above the ground, you know, that helps. That can help the mitigation and environmental mitigation there. So, so I think, I like to say they've been receptive, and it's been a healthy communication there in terms of trying to find broader solutions that really facilitate the project within the federal timeframes.

Thank you, Mark. Deputy Director, Scott Adams. Looked like you had a comment on that as well.

Yeah, I would just add to, to what, what Paul and Mark have said in that, you know, I think more broadly that this is one of those areas where the middle mile broadband initiative intersects with the broadband for all action plan, where there's a specific item about, you know, working to streamline permitting

processes at all levels. And so, as Paul had noted, the first step is it is it relates to the middle mile. The California Natural Resources Agency has been incredibly helpful and convening, you know, those permitting and resource entities, you know, that are under their umbrella. And I think as Mark said that it's been highly receptive. And what we've learned is that in order to look at these programmatic approaches statewide on the middle mile, that it was really important to bring these partners in early and you know, make them aware of the size and scale of the project and just you know, give them a view of a conceptualized, you know, map of the entire state and where these projects are going to be so that the conversations have been, you know, the collective conversations have been fruitful and we've had a series of following conversations with individual agencies themselves to to learn more about what their needs would be to help facilitate and, you know, the process of permitting, so those are going very well. And I think just on the multi levels that director Tong was speaking about. We are adopting a similar approach with, you know, both the federal permitting agencies at the…and, you know, the effort on the local side to work with Go Biz who's doing a lot of work with the local folks and some of our other partners to develop sort of a permitting checklist and playbook and then intend to convene with the tribal governments and other subject matter expertise, you know, with, you know, within the TPA and the PUC to talk about how we can expedite that. So, we're pleased with the progress thus far and understand how important it is to delivering both the middle mile and the last mile solutions as part of SB 156.

Thank you. I didn't mean to dominate the question. I'll… Yeah, go ahead.

Thank you very much. Member Quirk Silva. Would you like to jump back to your questions?

Yes, and I apologize. These are actually really questions related to the Executive Report. So didn't quite jump in. But if you just give me a minute or two, I did want to update the committee that is the chair of the communications and conveyance committee. We did hear a…hold a hearing, related to middle mile for assembly members and the public. We had a very thorough report from many of you. We appreciate it. There were good questions from the members. I think that a few of the lingering questions or takeaways. I'll just mention, three of them as one is members expressing their preference that the project planning rely on strong metrics, which we know you're really capable of, that project funding is being used efficiently. And of course, as we said, from the very beginning, worst first I say, Mr. McGuire I think he's been to that term. But secondly, there was some, again, very specific questions on that initial 18 projects. And I think that that will continue and so I know that I believe Mark Monroe answered very specifically how that came about but I would just let you know that there are questions. The second or third I should say, there was a member that from the public that testified from the CWA. I think I saw him on here, Stan from CWA. And I thought that he did have two or three really good remarks. One was and it could be a future topic for an agenda was on the workforce related to lane And if you want to say this fiber across the state, where are we on the workforce are there…can we look at that in the future, then one piece of information that he did present the eyes of somebody could answer it today would be great. And that's, are we using in essence, old types of infrastructure like from car…sorry, copper that with climate change and fire that could this be a major issue for us related to that? Then I'll just finally meet move to the executive report with the report that just came out kind of a summarizing where you've been, and I thought it was very well done, very compact. Appreciate that. But one of the questions is on the funding part of this, that the network is expected to be at 100 miles, the cost is projected to be $455 million, but those numbers exceed already exceed the budget of $3.25 million. So again, maybe Mark, if you could comment on that we just don't want to get, I think you're seeing a little

bit of concern from members saying we don't want to get out on this project and not be able to complete it or kind of get to 2026 and we run out of time and funds. Second question under the report is the 18 locations identified. For the middle mile the first 18 are expected to connect 279,000 homes or schools or institutions. Are those locations currently served or underserved? So, the locations that are going to be getting connected in these first 18 projects are how many of those are going to be served versus unserved? And then last question from me. The report says that SB 156, there are more than 200 ISPs currently operating in the state. And there's also other entities including locals and tribal governments that may be able to participate. Are we aware of any particular ISPs that has committed to or expressed interest in connecting with the MMPI so very specific, as you know, we have an excellent consultant and I wish I could say these all pop into my mind, but he's working on behalf of the State of California to make sure we can get this project done on time on budget and so forth. But thank you, those are my questions for today.

Thank you Member Quirk Silva. I think a number of those questions will actually be addressed in some of the presentations that are coming up from the TPA and CPUC. So, what I'll do is hold responses to some of those and then address the outstanding items that weren't addressed in those presentations. If that is okay with you Member Quirk Silva.

So, yes, very good. Thank you.

Thank you. Miss Miller, I see your hand up as well.

Thank you, Mr. Nichols. I just want to differentiate a little bit Assemblymember Quirk Silva between worst first and building out a whole network. So, I think and I agree, you have an amazing consultant and I'm sure he's, he's talked a lot about this. In order to build the entire network, there's a reason it's not specifically just about kind of the, the only the very worst areas in order to get the nodes and the network to actually function the way we want it to and to get to all the areas. It's, it's why we're not going to kind of bifurcate it that way. That wouldn't be a way to build an entire network. That was obviously something we had hoped for decades that that would be provided by the providers. And now in order for us to build our network because we don't have access to every piece of middle mile, I think it's a little bit more complicated than that. So, Mr. Nichols, as we go through and answer other questions. I think it'll be really important to address that piece because I just don't want there to be any confusion that absolutely the priority is worst first serve people that haven't been served. The way to get there, however, is no longer binary because we don't have access to the entire middle mile network that providers do. So I, I really want to draw that distinction and will we look forward to continue working with your team and your staff on that so I, if that's okay, Mr. Nichols, if we could just in addition to the really, really amazing questions Assemblymember Quirk Silva asked if we could just kind of focus on, on why the network build the way we built it and all the different nodes that have to go out in order to provide the service are so important. Thank you.

Actually, we thank you, Miss Miller. And I do think some of these comments tied nicely to the presentations you're about to see. So not seeing any other hands. Let's transition to Mr. Rob Osborn, who will give a briefing from the PUC.

Morning. I'm Rob Osborn, director of the Communications Division at the Public Utilities Commission. But to summarize the comprehensive analysis, the California Public Utilities Commission conducted on the elements and prioritization required in Senate Bill 156. This slide summarizes the key middle mile

related activities that SB 156 tasked the CPUC to perform. The statute states that the commission shall identify statewide Open Access middle mile broadband network locations that will enable last mile service connections and are in communities where there is no known middle mile infrastructure that is open access with sufficient capacity and at affordable rates. Next, the PUC initiated two rulings in our 209001 where we solicit public comment on proposed middle mile locations and network characteristics. The data report on the hub site that we'll go through today separates the eligibility analyses required by statute in Government Code 11549.54, along with the public comment map and the data that I just mentioned. The data and report were transmitted to the California Department of Technology earlier this week and posted to the middle mile initiative website. Next slide please. So, the report site is organized around statute, eligibility analysis, prioritization and public comments specified in the statute. At the bottom of this site, which is not shown here, but if you scroll down to the bottom and you can put the link into the chat so you're able to see this, has downloadable data. These analyses are illustrated on the site with maps and underlying data. Each map has an information button, which tells you how we at the PUC thought about the analysis and the data that was used. The datasets combining the analysis are downloadable in an open data format. So, what you see here is the landing page, the middle mile network location shows the current identified locations. The analysis button, which is the second one to the right, illustrates the eligibility analysis, the open access with sufficient capacity and affordable rate analyses in the code. Then, the prioritization, we have eight maps and the privatization button, and public comment, and then finally, the underlying data. I'm going to talk about the analysis part of the state highway network and then the various priorities listed in Senate Bill 156 for how these state highway network routes should be considered. Next slide, please. So, this is the Open Access Map. This is an example of the Open Access eligibility analysis required by statute some key concepts to communicate about how this information is displayed. So, the analysis is described for each tile or map. You see down at the bottom, there's an information button, and there's a table and those will allow you to find out more about the data itself and then the table will provide summary data for the state. So, I just want to emphasize that this, these two buttons down at the bottom left are really important for understanding more about the data that you're seeing visualized. Next, slide please. So, this is what comes up when you click the information tab button. So, for the open access, just as an example, the open access analysis was performed on the state highway network segments where at least 95% of the segments do not have an open access point or fiber line within one mile, the state highway network centerline. So, the key data included in this analysis were provider responses to the CPUC's 2021 data request, planned open access networks, and California Advanced Services Fund middle mile networks that are subject to open access requirements. Next slide please. So, the bottom dark area at the corner of the map shows the Data tab and this is an example I'll show you next of the relevant data that appears when you click that button. Next slide please. So, the data button for this open access analysis shows this table this is the state highway network meeting Open Access analysis criteria statewide and by county. The data can be downloaded in comma separated value format or CSV with the link in the upper right. Next slide, please. Finally, at the bottom of the slide is a data section with the public datasets for download each tile on the section links to the downloadable data that was the basis for these analyses and visuals. The data sources will continue to be updated to make more data available and to share updated datasets and analysis. So, to summarize the key points from this presentation the website is organized around the eligibility analysis and privatization in the statute. Each tile linked to a visualization and data. For a given visual the information button at the bottom left explains the analytical criteria and data sources for the analysis. And then finally, the data can be

downloaded from the Data tab or as a statewide data set in the Data section. With that we can go on to the next slide. So now I want to shift gears a bit to provide an update on the last mile initiatives, want to highlight some activities since the last middle mile advisory committee meeting that are relevant to past discussions. So first the CPUC implemented a Broadband Technical Assistance Grant Program in February. There's more information available on that on our local agency technical assistance page. We're now working on implementing the program rules and aiming to begin accepting applications in early May targeting awards as soon as possible thereafter. Second, a proposed decision on implementing the last mile initiative federal funding account was issued March 2. Opening comments are due March 22, which is next week and reply comments are due March 29. Informal comments can be filed on the docket card for rulemaking 20-09-001. So, the last mile initiative federal funding account proposed decision could be voted on at the earliest April 7 at the public meeting. We're aiming to begin accepting applications in July and awarding between July through December. Third, a comment ruling was issued in the California Net Services Fund rulemaking which is r20- 08-021 to request comment and build the record for a number of topics to implement the California Event Services Fund various accounts in the loan loss reserve fund. And that concludes my remarks on the slide but before I end, I wanted to address two questions from Assemblymember Quirk Silva. The first question was regarding the 279,000 homes, schools, and anchor institutions. So, the locations are unserved and they're in census blocks where no provider reported validated deployment. The data is the number of serviceable locations which are unserved, it's the speeds of unserved at 25 down and 3 up megabits per second, and they exclude legacy technology so that would be copper based digital subscriber line DSL and DOCSIS 2.0. The data is categorized by residential and non-residential units which are located within five miles of the state highway network center line using the most recent California broadband deployment data gathered as of December 31st 2020. The estimate does not consider the benefits to already served locations. And then the second question from Assemblymember Quirk Silva was regarding the 200 ISPs operating in the State of California. So, there's more than 200 but there's 200 that we're aware of that we regularly interface with our broadband data collection. But the CPUC is implementing last mile programs according to legislation and expects a significant number of new ISPs formed by local governments to respond to or apply for grants. In addition, a number of private providers have that, have historically applied for CASF infrastructure grants will likely interconnect with the middle mile network and service providers have filed comments in the PUC's request for comment about middle mile locations and expressed their interest in connecting with the middle mountain network. And we are engaged in a number of conversations now with recent CASF grantees about possible synergies with their middle mile plans and the statewide middle mile network. Sorry, I realized it's a mouthful and I'm going to stop there see if there are any more questions.

Before Chair Nichols facilitate the questions, we'd like to respectfully remind members of the public who are attending if they could please refrain from public comment until the public comment period and take your hands down, so it makes it easier for the chair to facilitate the discussion. Thank you.

Thank you, Jules. Alright, at this point from the committee members, any questions for Mr. Osborn, just reminder to raise your hand using the functionality in zoom and we will unmute your microphones. Not seeing any at this point. We will move on to the next presentation in the agenda. So let me introduce Mr. Tony Naughtin, the from third party administrator of the state, Tony.

Thank you, Russ. GoldenState Net as a third-party administrator for the MMBI program submitted detailed packages for each of the 18 initial projects in late January. We're here today to review those for

you quite a bit of information to share on 18 projects in what's probably going to be about 20 minutes. So, as you can guess we're going to move pretty quickly. If you have questions, feel free to ask them along the way. We are in a compressed time format. So, if we don't get to your questions today, of course we're available at all times to answer questions anyone here may have. The highlight slides we're going to show will, will summarize highlights for each project and then show a map for each project within the state location. Joining me today for this presentation is GoldenState Nets' Chief Technology Officer Ron Hutchins and our Vice President for Network Development Eric (?). We submitted these packages in late January, and they're all based on ring topologies which of course, enable resiliency and redundancy in the network. And these ring topologies are very important because they will serve as a foundation for the entirety of the network, where we will be making extensions from them to close rings around the entire state comprising the entire middle mile network. The 18 projects we recommended represent just over 2200 miles of new middle mile network at an approximate projected cost of $802 million. As I say they're foundational to the remainder of the network. And again, I want to remind everyone the full packages are available for review at both the CDT website and then by early next week, the full packages will also be available on our Golden State website. So, if we can move to the next slide, please. I'm going to introduce Eric (?), our VP of Development. Eric is going to walk through each of these projects quickly. We're going to show a 'highlights' slide and then about 10 to 15 seconds after we show that slide, we'll move on to the map for each project. Eric?

Thanks, Tony. The projects let's be clear, these are the initial projects and will be tied together eventually via fiber optic cables throughout the state. So, these are just anchor initial projects that we want to review this morning. They're not in any particular order. They're in priority. They're just simply north to south in general. So, for ease of discussing, we just moved across the map. And initially here if you go to the next slide, please. We have Siskiyou County which was identified as a top priority for construction. We've found that we can, through collaborations with the rural local exchange carriers and two key tribal entities in the area we could develop about 181 miles of new fiber build and in conjunction with current construction efforts, we could collaborate with the local carriers to provide a ring topology that would help connect the region back to the I-5 corridor and create resiliency. Do you want to move on please to the second? So, in the second project, Plumas to Tehama areas we want to tie the Eastern Sierra connectivity requirements to the I-5 corridor and the design goes right through Tehama County, an area identified by the CPUC as a top priority of need. In addition to that were working with entities like PG&E to evaluate potential collaboration for joint bill. And on the eastern end, we're aware of potential carrier options to also leverage joint build opportunities to reduce overall costs. But the goal would be to strengthen the overall regional connectivity and the options for broadband in this area. Next slide, please. Lake County also a top priority for, for the CPUC. It also has a requirement for a significant amount of construction over 173 miles of build required and there are numerous tribal entities that might be able to take advantage of the construction once it's completed. In addition, alternative design routes along the 101 going to the south are possible creating redundancy and resiliency through a…through a telecommunication ring that would just strengthen all sorts of options along this uh, these markets. Next slide. Colusa County was identified initially as one of the top nine counties for broadband requirements, *<indiscernible>* county identified by the CPUC. It so happens that there's several tribal nations that are also in the area. There are CASF grants that were I think Rob Osborn mentioned these that are currently underway, and are through the collaboration with CDT and CPUC, we're in conversations with those entities to do joint build activities to, to really narrow in the design in the construction germane to the people of this county. So, the opportunity is, is really good

here because in addition to new infrastructure, there is some available infrastructure via the core network that might be possible to provide quick connectivity in this region. Next slide please. The next five projects are really tied together. Alpine County another county with poor options for, for connectivity, needing competitive fiber infrastructure to provide options. In addition to serve all tribal entities that are in the area, it could tie the I-5 corridor to the 395 corridor, creating and strengthening regional resiliency across the state in this area. There's a couple of routes here that we've identified as germane to providing that resiliency, they do dovetail with the additional projects to follow if you move to the next slide. Go ahead and move to the map please. Thank you or to the highlights. Yes. So additional tribal entities might benefit from this construction effort. 138 miles of construction on this project six and ultimately, all of these routes will connect to Sacramento, major telecom center providing multiple layers of service and telecommunication capabilities in the marketplace but as you can see in a ring topology is maintained so that there's resiliency and no particular market would be isolated it would be connected ultimately to the larger statewide network. Could you move to the next slide, please? And again, Calaveras as I indicated earlier is this one is a little bit smaller project in construction. But it is key into providing benefits to some tribal areas as well as improving resiliency. If you move to the map, it interconnects a larger area so that connectivity can be stabilized and options for broadband increased with fiber construction. Please move to the next slide. Oakland represents a slightly diverse solution set. The problem is not open access fiber as much as affordability and adoptability, adoption of broadband. If you go ahead and move to the map. So, you know Oakland is a very dense urban area and there's multiple routes that go through this area. And so at least in the first phase, we're proposing a solution of both existing core infrastructure which is lit today, utilizing some existing infrastructure that is currently on the Caltrans' right-of-way that local entities have identified as important to their network. That's the yellow piece there. And then in addition to that, there's open access network that goes through the heart of areas that have been identified as a top priority through organizations, they're in Oakland. The final piece here, this is not the end all be all but in the next phase, there's some additional construction that's going to be recommended as well. But this is just the initial project in Oakland area. If you could move to the next. Thank you. So, the Central Coast area is, is one of the most mountainous areas in the state and is subject to high risk of environmental impacts on networks. So, diversity is extremely important in this area. There are existing CASF grant infrastructure along Highway 17 that interconnects Santa Cruz to uh, to Sunnyvale and San Jose there. But local area providers and public comment has suggested that I-9 was a top priority. In addition to that in this project, the CPUC has prioritized at least initially here, the areas of Hollister and Gilroy and you'll see those on the eastern portion of this project map. We want to tie those together in a regional ring so that we can really create some substantial broadband connectivity for these markets. Next slide. West Fresno has a mix of adoption issues and broadband availability concerns. So, the design that we've proposed in this initial project reaches out into the rural areas of community identified by public comment and the CPUC as top priorities for connectivity. I want to point out that while it dovetails nicely, there's also potential for commercial partnerships to strengthen this network. Those aren't identified here but ongoing conversations about how to collaborate to strengthen this overall connectivity is in place, as well as working with local organizations to ensure that this is a correct fit for the marketplace. Next slide. Inyo, the Inyo project is a really remote area of the state. And there's a high need both in tribal areas and along some major portions which are sparsely supported. So, connectivity and wireless connectivity, mobile applications as well as community connectivity could benefit strongly from this project. I want to add that there's one piece that you can't really see here because it's a very

large area, but this would tie the 395 corridor down south creating resiliency and redundancy for this area so that it strengthens the overall possibility for broadband as the middle mile gets constructed. Next slide. So, the current project, as Rob Osborn had noted, many of the initial projects are really about underserved in-need areas. In Kern here, highlights that with 92 miles of potential construction, interconnecting the network to other projects we've already looked at, as well as tying it to existing potential broadband open access networks. So that the redundancy to the east and west here is created as well as options for broadband services in each of the communities that you see. Next slide. And going, continuing from current San Luis Obispo on uh, on West, we have some poorly covered areas need cell coverage as well as protection from environmental hazards. We've identified with the help of the CPUC and the CDT, some additional potential collaboration with carriers there to reduce the overall cost of this construction because this is a very long route in desperately needed fiber options that are required in the area, but we're, we're accelerating our conversations with those carriers who currently have a CASF grant particularly for last mile connectivity and how we might partner with them to strengthen their, their designs as well as accelerate construction for this particular project. Next slide. So, Project 14, high risk area again environmental issues of large concern but improving reliability and capabilities for residents and businesses is really important here. There are some open access connectivity through the area but they don't really reach far enough into the areas of need. So, our recommendation has been to collaborate but also to construct state owned middle mile infrastructure to really reach into the middle mile requirements so that last mile carriers can have the opportunity to leverage the middle mile for their connectivity needs. Next slide please. Los Angeles, in some ways is similar to the Oakland area in that there's numerous open access providers in the marketplace. If you move to the next slide, you'll see here that fiber is ubiquitously throughout the area. So, the issues are really about affordability and adoption. The CPUC has identified key corridors that are in need and recommended construction here. The TPA wants to work closely with CDT and the CPUC to identify precisely how to best tackle this. While we've, we're evaluating potential joint build collaborations that are entering into the area, we're not sure how those might fit to solve the larger need of affordability and adoption. And we're working closely with some entities in the LA County to make sure that we tailor a middle mile solution that really services the marketplace. In phase two of the middle mile construction proposals, we'll have more interconnectedness of these routes. But initially these are part of our recommendation for construction. In many ways, Orange County is a similar story to LA County, in that there are numerous Open Access fiber networks possible to leverage but in addition to that, there's a strong opportunity to do construction. So here again, we see the option for instantly lighting and connecting core services to any potential backbone, but we have key areas that the CPUC has highlighted as potential for backhaul to strengthen connectivity and those marketplaces where folks need more affordable access. Coachella Valley is one of the more interesting opportunities because it's pretty extensive. It requires a combination of both joint build local area collaboration and construction. And there's a significant amount of opportunity to, to service tribal entities in this area. If you go to the map, thank you. So, in addition to a combination of joint build, which is highlighted with the dashed lines, capturing some of the CPUC priorities. You can see that there's numerous tribal entities that might benefit from this and I just want to remind folks that the states open access networks makes availability anywhere along the route not just at points of presence. So, the opportunities to leverage the fiber anywhere along the fiber route is available to any of the constituents of California. So, the goal would be to tie together the Coachella Valley, moving both on the western shores of the Salton Sea down through to the I-8 corridor and interconnecting it into the larger region back to the I-5, so very large regional ring, but we plan to tie

those together in the next project. If you can flip to that. So Riverside, San Diego, very rugged mountainous areas prone to severe fire hazards, numerous, numerous tribal nations throughout the area. But we have a couple of good opportunities not just interconnecting the tribes but also diversifying connectivity back over the mountains to the Coachella Valley, but interconnecting the entire region and also the potential to spur economic development there along, along the western shores of the Salton Sea, where I guess recently, potential economic benefits from lithium mines have been identified. Tying all of that back into the San Diego infrastructure where major telecom hubs do exist, which strengthen the potential broadband for all of the parties across this region. Move to the next. Tony, do you want to wrap it up with anything?

Yeah, thank you. And, again, we're showing the statewide map for the initial 18 projects a bit down the road. Going forward, you'll see a map like this that shows the 18 projects as well as the remainder of the middle mile network that we've worked on and are recommending. I think we have a little time here for questions if we may. If that's okay, Russ, and others and as I said, I'm joined here by Eric, who just spoke as well as Ron Hutchins, our CTO. What questions can we answer for you here in the next few minutes?

We do have a question from Mike Keever over at Caltrans. However, prior to doing that Mark Monroe if you want to jump in, I think your presentation actually is a good handshake to this and very quick, if you'd like to jump in and then we'll transition to Mr. Keever.

Good idea.

Absolutely, absolutely. Really appreciate all of GoldenState Net's work on putting this together. As we mentioned, we have come out with 885 miles of construction for the initial 18 projects last November. And we've just seen this broader presentation, which is I think more than 2200 miles based on what, what CDT had asked GoldenState Net to do in terms of kind of analyzing the plans and clarifying the mapping, the miles, and whatnot. And so, and kind of looking at that broader system level approach. And so we, we spent our, CDT spent, you know, February working through these plans with GoldenState Net to really understand and clarify where the miles were and kind of what the components were, how much was going there with the recommended build versus how much will be joint builds or, or leases and IRUs. And so at this point, we've identified more than 1400 thirty miles of construction, and that's, you know, the, the difference there, the roughly 600 mile difference is in addition to the 885 that was announced last, last November. So, CDT has asked Caltrans to expand its pre-construction activities to, to include this higher construction amount. These expanded build segments, they don't reduce anything that we, that CDT is, is having Caltrans work on but represent that expansion instead of roughly 600 miles. We've been working with Caltrans to expand construction segments as further decisions are being made. And you know, working this in through CDT's GIS mapping efforts to, to roll this out and help Caltrans to work on it. Next steps we're having, you know, GoldenState Net is working with CDT in finalizing broader statewide, broader statewide system identifying the components of that and what that looks like including any potential IRU locations as Caltrans' construction cost estimates are refined IRU alternatives, will further be evaluated and of course all this question regarding the concerns in the legislature about what we can afford and really we do look at this as you know, the SB 156 really gave us this mission of constructing as much of this system as possible. And so this is really important as Caltrans goes through this pre-construction process, it's gonna, we're working on how we refined the construction costs to get a better understanding of just how much we can afford to build, but we do have this tool for being able to, to lease and so I think that that's the other really important component

is that as we move forward, we'll have to we have to kind of maximize the amount that we build and then and then decide strategically where the most appropriate place to lease is in terms of you know, being able to provide this broader service statewide.

If I may, and Mark thank you for that. Ron Hutchins, our CTO, Ron, I wanted to ask you to, at a high level walkthrough please, what we're calling with CDT, the optimization process, as we've talked about to work with CDT in determining within the available budget, how much of this can we newly construct as a priority, and then and then working with the remainder to make the available funds go as far as they can through other approaches such as dark fiber, IRU, and joint bills?

Sure, thank you, Tony. Just real briefly just to keep us on track, in building a network, in my mind, you build a network for the entire state, the entire thing that you're doing, and that's what we've tried to do in our minds is build this as Mark has said, systems level view of the network. And we've taken a first step of building out a design and taking the assumption that we're going to construct everything. I don't think it's possible with the funding we have to construct everything but that's our first approach, let's construct everything from there as we get the bids back from Caltrans, we can look at optimizing that construction by replacing some with IRUs with optimizing the network equipment itself to reduce costs and come out with a network that is both cost effective and covers the state whether that's completely possible or not, we'll have to see that the least we're starting with those areas that are just must-builds as we've said the no regret locations or places where there is no fiber, to think about building fiber on top of places where there are fiber that was already there to me is sort of the second tier. We may still do that. It may be a good idea, but we start with places where there is no fiber. That gives the people a chance to build out networks locally. It gives us a chance to build out a network backbone as well. From there, we can optimize the rest of the network, as I mentioned earlier and come up with I think a very good value for the State of California.

Okay, thank you Tony, Ron and the TPA team and Mark as well, we'll transition into some questions from the committee members and we are approaching the public comment period and Jules will give some additional instruction for that. So let me go first. Mr. Keever, you had your hand up a moment ago. See that it's down now. But let me pause and see if we can unmute you or your question.

Thank you, Russ. In the interest of time, I'm going to try to get my question answered offline. So, I'll defer to others, thank you.

All right. Thank you, Mr. Keever. Mr. Wood, you had your hand up as well.

Oh, okay. Thank you very much. Senator McGuire. Thank you so much, I'll be brief. If this is something that Mr. Monroe is in the loop on, Ms. Miller is on the loop on, but I think as we move forward and understand that these are our first projects, and grateful for getting these projects moved in soon, to see construction on the ground, I think what's going to be important is, is we have some time to pre-plan some of this is to be in communication with those counties that will be the epicenter for these projects as we move forward. Right? So…Mr. (?) was able to articulate how many miles potentially which communities would be served. And as we move forward, I think that's what the counties are going to want on the front end. Because at least in these initial projects, a lot of questions came in, that weren't able to be answered again, we're early in on this. I just want to I understand expectations. But I think that's going to be important as we move forward is early communication and often so that they

can answer constituents' questions as they are being advanced, fast and furious and I know that this is a priority for Mr. Monroe as well and look forward to working order to work with each of you on that.

Thank you, Senator McGuire. All right. Any other committee members have questions or comments for the TPA or Mr. Monroe? All right, Secretary Tong, go ahead.

Sorry, I, if I could just I, I appreciate the questions and just want to do a shout out to the collective work on this and Mr. (?) did a good job in rolling off 18 initial updates. But in that even 20 minutes of presentation is a reflection of months of work from you know the identification to making a recommendation and then the very complex analysis, and also making all of this information accessible to the public on the website from accessibility aspect perspective. So, I just wanted to give a shout out to the combination of CDT team, CPUC was part of it, CalTrans as well as the TPA for putting this initial set of information out there and looking forward for what's more to come, hopefully in April timeframe, of the rest of the network if this was a preview, we're going to see what's going to come very, very soon. So very excited about that.

Thank you, Secretary Tong. Thank you for acknowledging that immense amount of work. Member Wood, you have your hand up as well.

Thank you. Yeah, thank you and I pulled it down and I put it back up but just a question. In the presentation about the 18 projects there was multiple times I heard, try to reach tribes that are in remote areas and so on. Can you give a rough idea of what you mean by that? And let me put it into perspective for you. So, I in my assembly district I have more tribes than any member of the legislature other than Senator McGuire and his senate district. So, and they are extremely remote and essentially unserved by the definitions that we're using. And so, I want to understand how you know, how close are we getting to give them opportunities to do last mile because some of the areas are really, really remote.

Does the CDT you want to take that, or should I take that?

Well, I think I guess I would understand that question. So certainly, the…you know, tribal communities are our priority. They're mentioned in SB 156. Absolutely. And so, as we, as we build up the network there, you can see on all the maps we're identifying where they're located. And so, you know, the same, the same constraints, the same challenges we have, you know, as anywhere else in the state where we've got, you know, some, some remote areas, but we have people we have need out there. And so…I think, you know, as we as we look at the, the overall statewide map that we're building out to, provided by the PUC and that we're working on with GoldenState Net, that we're certainly taking those areas into account. And, and want to, to make sure that as we, as we build out this middle mile, that there are, there are, there's the same last mile process that that PUC is heading up in terms of being able to tie those communities and link them back to our middle mile.

I guess what I'm trying to get an idea, and this will be this more of a statement than anything and so, none of the 18 projects touch my district or they touch but they don't really do anything. Do have any major projects in my district? So, so I'm just trying to be able to respond to some of the entities that are asking me questions as to, you know, what, what might we expect regards to this and so it is important to hear that tribal, tribal communities are a priority. But I think they're gonna they're gonna want to know, what does that mean? And we still have people, and I was meeting with a tribe yesterday, as

some of the people in in in and that in that particular tribe, that what even if we could reach them, they may not be able to take advantage of because they don't, some of them don't have electricity. Some of them don't have any water. And, but there are others that do and, and the service levels that they have are, are practically nothing so, so they're anxious, and they kind of want to know what you know, what does this ultimately mean?

I'd like to add I'm sorry, I would like to add a bit onto Mark's statement because there's some elements that are the really beneficial to the state for, for having the state having its own fiber. And that is flexibility because today, carriers who construct typically don't allow flexibility with their network but the state owning its own fiber even if it buys or leases or constructs even moreso, we'll have much more flexibility and by that I mean that the plan is to put a splice case we're talking, you know, fiber here physical at every important stop along the road as frequently as every five miles. And then the option when the state constructs fiber is to be able to do a ring cut where appropriate future proofing any potential last mile requirement, every half mile along the route meaning any tribe that is not ready today, but will be tomorrow could take advantage of that, any planning organization anywhere in the state could take advantage of what the state has constructed. So, in some ways, it kind of future proofs the design of the network to make sure that whatever is ready tomorrow or today can access the fiber directly when they are ready.

And I would also like to add if I may. We understand the importance of the tribal outreach and working collaboratively with the tribes as much as possible in the context of the first 18 projects, we have made some considerable outreach to a variety of the tribes in these locations. And actually, we have a member of our team Matt Rantanon, who is very focused on interacting and reaching out to tribes so we can foster collaboration with them. It's our hope that this not only brings broadband services to the tribal lands but provides other economic development opportunities for the tribes themselves.

Thank you.

Thank you very much, Mr. Wood. And for the responses, they're obviously with the first 18 projects, this is starting a much larger statewide effort, but a lot of information that detail the 18 and we appreciate all the work that's gone into that so thank you very much for all those presentations. At this point, any other questions from the committee members for the presenters? All right, if not, we will transition into the public comment portion of the meeting. Jules if you are prepared, go ahead and give the instructions for the members of the public again.

Certainly, in order to allow everyone who wishes to make public comment the time to do so. We respectfully request one person per entity and no more than two minutes per person for public comments. For those on the phone again solely for those on the phone, please text or email middlemile@state.ca.gov noting that you would like to make a public comment and the phone number for which you would like to do it. We'll start with the public comments submitted online prior to the meeting. We did have one from Andrew Kasner. Is Mr. Kasner here? It doesn't appear he's here. He basically said that he's from the Grass Valley area, that they have limited provider options, limited speeds most people are in dial up and the existing providers charge large fees to be able to even get that dial up. And he wanted the committee to be aware. If those on zoom would go ahead and raise their zoom hands so we can acknowledge you. We will start with Stan from CWA, please go ahead.

I didn't know if I supposed to turn on my camera or not, but I just wanted to follow up on something that Representative Quirk Silva said and that was just to clarify or expand on that just briefly is I was working for example in Kingsburg just Monday and they're still building copper networks, which are already an obsolete technology, and the community and a developer…and the developer is investing millions of dollars, they have subdivision that's in about three four different phases. And you know, 400 homes approximately going up in that area, brand new, its population 11,000 community and still building copper and they're begging for fiber so, but they're not on the map and we just couldn't cover it. You know, it's it was very difficult to get the areas covered that we wanted. Also, in the fire restorations in Placerville I'm seeing ducts going in the ground by PG&E and they're burying them and then they're paving over on a busy mountain road, and I see 50 feet from their copper cables on telephone poles criss-crossing that busy mountain road serving those communities. And AT&T will not take you know the offer by PG&E to underground their facilities which would lend itself to upgrading their facilities to fiber. It's just not happening and unless somebody mandates it or it's legislated, it's not going to happen. And so that's my big disappointment from doing that. The last thing is in Fresno County there are significant tribal communities dispersed up in the mountains and they're not federally recognized. They don't have a casino. Some of the casino ones and the federally recognized ones actually have IT departments and they're very sophisticated. But there are many in between that are not served in or the Middle Mile will not reach which would require them some type of CASF application which would include, in a sense Middle Mile, which would make it more costly, but I'll just address that in another way through other you know, forums and probably by email and communication with you but I thought you should know at this level at least just some of that information. Thank you very much.

Thank you, Shayne Englin. Hi, thank you this is Shayne Englin. I'm with the California Community Foundation. I run the digital equity initiative, and we want to continue to voice our concerns about over reliance on IRUs. Public money going to rent private infrastructure will ultimately just for not as it doesn't result in a durable public asset, and it leads on the not well supported by the evidence hope that new money will become available down the road or that private networks will somehow be you know better meet the need than they have to date. So, every dollar spent on IRUs is a dollar spent to kick the can down the road. And therefore, we really support CDT's approach by far of building first as a responsible stewardship of this historic investment of public dollars. And really specific to Los Angeles where we are. We're concerned about the map indicating 100% long term IRUs as a solution. And so therefore appreciate CDT's hold on approving that plan and continuing to work on that and want to offer our partnership, those of the CBOs in our network to do that. And then finally, we really encourage the systems thinking approach that was discussed by CDT at this meeting. All Californians benefit from building in dense core areas. The utility of a network for people in remote areas is by definition improved by anchorage elsewhere in the network where things like hospitals and offices and educational facilities are and I fully recognize the political complexity of this argument. But it remains true that building in LA is good for people in Alpine County. So, thank you all for your continued work and engagement on this. We appreciate the transparency and opportunity to partner with you on it. Thank you.

Thank you. We don't have any more hands and the person on the phone did not say that they'd like to make a public comment. So, is there anyone else that'd like to make a public comment? We are not seeing any hands right now. Jaden Shandler.

Can you hear me?

Yes. Mr. Shandler go ahead. We may have lost Mr. Shandler.

It doesn't appear he's on the screen. He may have disconnected accidentally. For anybody who would like to make public comment at any time, there is a link online where you can do so. So, I think unless Mr. Shandler comes back, we're good.

Thank you Jules. Let me go back to the committee members one last time. Let me start with Mark Monroe. Did you have any closing comments?

Sure. Certainly. Really wanted to kind of give the committee members just a little more heads up on kind of where, where we're headed so you know, we've been, we've focused obviously, you know, we've made a lot of sense to start on these 18 projects and really appreciate everybody's you know work and pulling those together and developing them, appreciate Caltrans work and of (?) as well as GoldenState Net's work in terms of trying to help envision the broader system but just want folks understand we're kind of moving we're at a stage now where we're really pivoting to focusing on the broader statewide network. And so, you know, in the in the weeks to come I would anticipate certainly in April and subsequent MMAC meetings to really be coming out with a kind of pivoting to a discussion of the broader network, the broader statewide need, and kind of what that map looks like. And so, we would be, you know, planning reaching out and kind of trying to provide some updates to, you know, to the members in the weeks to come here, I would say, as we as we kind of continue to do our analysis of and work with GoldenState Net, about kind of what that looks like. We will be reaching out and try to keep the members informed both at subsequent MMAC meetings and in between them since they only happen once every month.

Thank you, Mr. Monroe. I see that we do have one last public comment hand raised so Jules, if you would like to call on Mr. Pholman. Mr. Pholman, go ahead.

Yes. Just a quick comment on the IRU versus build. I think one aspect that's often overlooked with IRUs is, it is a 20-year asset that the state would own, and it also protects you against obsolescence as was mentioned earlier about the amount of copper I mean, obviously 20 years from now, fiber may not be the go forward or the right technology to meet the needs of the state. And so just as if 20 years ago, you would have made a huge investment in building your own copper, he kind of be stuck with, you know, sub optimal platform to expand broadband so that was my comment. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Pholman. All right, that will conclude our public comment portion. Let me focus back to the members of the committee very quickly and see if other members of the committee have questions or comments. All right. Seeing none, remind everyone, our next meeting is scheduled for Friday, April 22. Also 10 to 11:30am however, there are such… Miss Miller, I see your hand. I'm sorry. Jules if you, Jules if you could unmute Miss Miller. I think there's one more. ,

Yeah. Sorry Mr. Chair, I was just letting you know, there was another public comment person. Thank you. Alright, Jules, if you can unmute Miss Keegan. Miss Keegan, go ahead.

Hi, thank you so much. I really appreciate all the work that has been done here. I'm here with BluePath Health. I just wanted to support the comment made by the LA Community Foundation. I think one of actually the great things about fiber is that it is future proof and wires themselves are actually not limited in terms of speed. And what actually limits the speed of fiber technology is the technology at the ends of the wires. So, fiber will likely last in terms of speed and technological advances as we want to

have faster internet for a long, long time. So, fiber is future proof. It's a great technology and will last a long time. So, thank you so much.

Thank you Miss Keegan, I appreciate that. All right. Thank you all for the patience during today's meeting as we use the new format. It is a little more labor intensive to call on folks and wait just for a second as technology catches up as we mute and unmute. But thank you for the patience with that. I think overall the process worked well. A reminder again next month's meeting is April 22nd, 10 o'clock in the morning. At this point, the executive order that allows completely virtual meetings is set to expire. So, we are in the process of determining the location to conduct this as a more normal and I'll put that in air quotes, public meeting and will be broadcast and still allow for public comments remotely. But we are looking forward to having quorum of the Middle Mile Advisory Committee members in-person and we will be letting the members know the location logistics of that very shortly. So, thank you again for joining this morning. One last momentary pause to see if there are comments or questions from any committee members. And seeing none, I wish you all the very best of mornings and we will talk to you next month. Thank you for joining us today.

Sent: Wednesday, March 2, 2022 9:00 AM
To: CA Middle Mile Advisory Committee
Subject: MMBI Public Comment Form Response

Sent by: Andrew Kastner

Organization:

Comment:

I recently moved to Grass Valley CA . Many people here are on Dial up speed. The best we could get is 12 down and 2 up. We work from home and it is is difficult. I know so many people here that hardly have any speed at all. Starlink is in the area but only servicing a few homes. Race communications has Fiber optic about 1 mile from our house along the 174 corridor, but they won't bring it the 1 mile to our house. So many homes do not have decent internet between Grass Valley and Nevada City. Some have Sudden link and Comcast here but they only service the main streets, Anyone else who is not right on a Main Street is lucky if they can get Smarter Broadband which is what we have and like I said the best they offer is 12 down and 2 up and it costs $90 per month. I am a videographer and I can hardly upload anything. Plus we had to pay $350 for them to come out and put a dish up in a tall tree. I know I speak for countless others when we say, please put us on your radar for the Middle Mile. Thanks you Andrew

If you want to unsubscribe from these emails, please use this form.